

FILED

2007 OCT 19 PM 1:43

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY ds DEPUTY

Patricia Lynn Jacks
Attorney at Law
CA State Bar No. 226300
5790 Friars Road F8
San Diego, CA 92110
Tel. (619) 574-1625
Attorney for Petitioner

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DMITRI VALLERVEICH TATARINOV,

'07 CV 2033 L NLS

Petitioner,

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. §2241

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO,

Respondent.

TOPICAL INDEX FOR CASE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii, iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
MOOTNESS.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	5
ARGUMENTS	
I. Attorney's conduct resulted in an irreconcilable conflict of interest between him and his client violating the Sixth Amendment right to conflict-free representation.....	6
II. Attorney's misconduct in permitting defendant's state appeal in another case to be dismissed, in lying about the status of the dismissed appeal, and representing that nothing could be done to revive the appeal, requires a finding of counsel's conflict of interest resulting in ineffective assistance of counsel violating the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.....	8
III. Attorney's misconduct in permitting defendant's state appeal in another case to be dismissed, in lying about the status of the dismissed appeal, the failure to file a "Wende brief" to protect the defendant's rights, and representing that nothing could be done to revive the appeal, requires a finding of counsel's conflict of interest resulting in ineffective assistance of counsel violating the Sixth Amendment guarantee that a defendant has the assistance necessary to justify reliance on the outcome of the proceeding.....	9

1 IV. The motion to vacate is made on grounds that could not have been raised
2 on direct appeal from the judgment itself and is not a duplicate appeal from the
3 judgment itself.....11
4

5 V. This motion is timely filed as the substantial rights of the defendant are
6 adversely affected by the immigration deportation proceedings the defendant is
7 facing12

8 CONCLUSION.....14

9 CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....15

10 PROOF OF SERVICE.....16
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Carafas v. LaVallee</i> , 391 U.S. 234, 238 (1968).....	3
<i>Cuyler v. Sullivan</i> , 446 U.S. 335 (1980).....	7
<i>Evitts v. Lucey</i> , 469 U.S. 387, 391 n.4 (1985).....	3
<i>Douglas v. California</i> , 372 U.S. 353 (1963).....	9
<i>Mooney v. Holohan</i> , 294 US 103 (1935).....	12
<i>Murguia v. Municipal Court</i> , 15 Cal.3d 286, 124 1975).....	12
<i>People v. Bailey</i> , 9 CA4th 1252 (1992).....	7
<i>People v Banks</i> , 53 Cal.2d 370 (1959)	12
<i>People v. Fosselman</i> , 33 Cal.3d 572, 189 (1983).....	12
<i>People v. Mroczko</i> , 35 C3d 86 (1983).....	7
<i>People v. Superior Court (Zamudio)</i> , 23 Cal.4th 183 (2000).....	13
<i>Rodriquez v. U.S.</i> , 395 U.S. 327 (1969).....	10, 11
<i>State Bar of California v. Vladimir Verhovskoy</i> , 01-O-00503 (2002).....	6
<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> , 466 U.S. 668 (1984)	10, 11
<i>United States v. Cronic</i> , 466 U.S. 648,659 (1984).....	11
<i>United States v. Levy</i> , 25 F3d 146 (2d Cir. 1994).....	8
<i>United States v. Mett</i> , 65 F.3d 1531 (9 th cir. 1995).....	2, 7
<i>Wood v. Georgia</i> , 450 U.S. 262,271 (1981).....	7

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES

U.S. Const. 6 th Amendment.....	2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14
U.S. Const. 14 th Amendment.....	8, 9, 11, 14
28 U.S.C. §2241.....	2
28 U.S.C. §2254.....	2

1	28 U.S.C. §2254(a).....	2
2	28 U.S.C. §2255.....	2
3	<u>IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT</u>	
4	237(a)(2)(A)(i).....	3, 6
5	<u>CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE</u>	
6	§ 148.....	4
7	§ 211.....	4
8	§ 484/666.....	3, 4
9	§ 1237.....	11, 12, 13
10	<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>	
11	Calif. Practice Guide Professional Responsibility 2005.....	7, 8
12	San Diego Bar Ass'n Form. Opn. 1995-1.....	7
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 Patricia Lynn Jacks
2 Attorney at Law
3 CA State Bar No. 226300
4 5790 Friars Road F8
5 San Diego, CA 92110
6 Tel. (619) 574-1625
7 Attorney for Petitioner

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DMITRI VALLERVEICH TATARINOV,

11 Petitioner,

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. §2241

12
13 v.

14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
15 CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO,

16 Respondent:
17

18
19 INTRODUCTION

20 Mr. Tatarinov moves to reinstate his post-conviction nonstatutory motion
21 to vacate a judgment entered after plea, or vacate the verdict from the Superior
22 Court of the State of California case number SCD 135946 on the grounds that he
23 received ineffective assistance counsel based on defense counsel's conflict of
24 interest rendering these critical stages constitutionally inadequate, in violation of
25 the state and federal rights to the effective assistance of counsel, due process, and
26 a fair trial. The collateral consequences of the conviction are the deportation of
27 Mr. Tatarinov and as such the case and controversy still exist.
28

1 The Supreme Court has held that it possesses jurisdiction under 28
2 U.S.C. §2241 to grant on "original" writ of habeas corpus to state or federal
3 prisoners in exceptional cases when there are procedural or jurisdictional
4 obstacles under U.S.C. §2254 or 2255. Under 28 U.S.C. §2255, "If the court
5 finds that the judgment was rendered without jurisdiction, or that the sentence
6 imposed was not authorized by law or otherwise open to collateral attack, or that
7 there has been such a denial or infringement of the constitutional rights of the
8 prisoner as to render the judgment vulnerable to collateral attack, the court shall
9 vacate and set the judgment aside and shall discharge the prisoner or resentence
10 him or grant a new trial or correct the sentence as may appear appropriate."
11 Likewise under U.S.C. §2254, a petition may be filed on "behalf of a person in
12 custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in
13 custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States."
14 Mr. Tatarinov has completed the California state sentencing imposed upon him
15 by this conviction, but, because of the collateral consequences of deportation, he
16 is being detained under Federal custody by Immigration Customs Enforcement.
17 He respectfully moves that the court grant his U.S.C. §2241 writ and vacate the
18 judgment based upon the violation of his constitutional rights.

21 JURISDICTION

22 The guarantees of the Sixth Amendment entitle defendants in criminal
23 cases the right to effective assistance of counsel, which includes the right to
24 conflict-free representation. *United States v. Mett*, 65 F.3d 1531 (9th cir. 1995.)

25 A Federal court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over a habeas
26 petition unless the petitioner is "in custody" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C.
27 §2254(a). Although Mr. Tatarinov is no longer in state custody or state probation
28

1 from this conviction, Mr. Tatarinov is currently in custody by the Immigration
2 and Customs Enforcement Detention and Removal Center located in San Diego,
3 CA. Mr. Tatarinov was found removable as an alien convicted of a crime
4 involving moral turpitude within five years of admission pursuant to section
5 237(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as well as an alien
6 convicted of two or more crimes involving moral turpitude from this conviction.
7 Excerpts of Record, pp. 115-117. In habeas corpus proceedings attacking a
8 criminal conviction, the case or controversy requirement normally is satisfied,
9 even after all potential custody has expired. Habeas jurisdiction is therefore
10 proper.
11

12 MOOTNESS

13 Collateral consequences from a state judgment or order may used to
14 establish that the case is not moot. *Carafas v. LaVallee*, 391 U.S. 234, 238
15 (1968). Such consequences include the “inability to vote, engage in certain
16 businesses, hold public office, or serve as a juror.” (Id. At 237-238). A
17 conviction usable in a “persistent felony offender” prosecution is a collateral
18 consequence that defeats any mootness objections when a habeas petitioner is no
19 longer in custody. *Evitts v. Lucey*, 469 U.S. 387, 391 n.4 (1985). Here, Mr.
20 Tatarinov overcomes mootness because under California’s “Three Strikes” law,
21 Mr. Tatarinov’s 484/666 shop lifting conviction can be used to increase the
22 punishment for subsequent felonies. Likewise, the conviction resulted in the
23 serious collateral consequence of affecting his immigration status making him
24 removable as an alien convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude within five
25 years of admission pursuant to section 237(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Immigration and
26
27
28

1 Nationality Act, as well as an alien convicted of two or more crimes involving
2 moral turpitude. Excerpts of Record, pp. 115-117.

3
4 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

5 On October 19, 1998 Mr. Tatarinov pled guilty to shop lifting. The charge
6 was upgraded to a felony due to a prior robbery conviction (SCD 119330) and he
7 was charged under California Penal Code Section 484/666. Mr. Tatarinov was
8 sentenced to 34 days of custody, imposition of the sentence was suspended and
9 he was placed on probation for five years. Attorney Verhovskoy (Verhovskoy)
10 represented Mr. Tatarinov and advised Mr. Tatarinov to plead guilty.

11 Prior to that conviction Mr. Tatarinov was charged in the California
12 Superior Court, case number SCD 119330, with one count of second degree
13 robbery in violation of California Penal Code section 211, and one count of
14 interfering with a police officer in violation of California Penal Code section
15 148. A jury convicted Mr. Tatarinov of robbery but acquitted him of violation
16 section 148 on August 12, 1996. The superior court granted probation. Excerpts
17 of Record, p. 77.

18
19 Mr. Tatarinov filed a timely notice of appeal to the California Court of
20 Appeal. The appeal was subsequently dismissed on April 28, 1997 after Mr.
21 Tatarinov's retained attorney, Verhovskoy, failed to file a written brief. Excerpts
22 of Record, p. 10. Verhovskoy thereafter intentionally misled Mr. Tatarinov and
23 his wife about the status of the appeal. Excerpts of Record, pp. 2-4, 6-7, 77-78.
24 Finally, Mr. Tatarinov's wife learned through her own efforts that the appeal had
25 been dismissed. Verhovskoy then filed an unsuccessful motion to reinstate the
26 appeal. By then, more than two years had passed since the appeal's dismissal.
27 Excerpts of Record, pp. 3, 78.
28

1 In December 2000 Verhovskoy sent Mr. Tatarinov a letter terminating his
2 representation. Excerpts of Record, pp. 4, 30, 78. The California State Bar
3 subsequently suspended Verhovskoy and commenced disciplinary proceedings
4 against him. Excerpts of Record, pp. 78, 131-134.
5

6 On October 23, 2006 Defendant filed a nonstatutory motion to vacate a
7 plea entered on grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel in the Superior Court
8 of California, County of San Diego. Excerpts of Record, pp. 107-126. The
9 Honorable Judge Jeffrey F. Fraser denied the motion ruling that the trial court
10 lacked jurisdiction to vacate the judgment. On November 2, 2006, a notice of
11 appeal was filed with Court of Appeal - State of California. Excerpts of Record,
12 p. 127. On June 1, 2007 the appeal was dismissed after Respondent's motion to
13 dismiss based on lack of jurisdiction. Excerpts of Record, p. 136. On June 12,
14 2007 a Petition for Review was filed in the Supreme Court of California. On
15 September 12, 2007 the petition for review was denied. Excerpts of Record, p.
16 137.
17

18 STATEMENT OF FACTS

19 In December 2000, Verhovskoy continued to represent Mr. Tatarinov on
20 an immigration matter. Verhovskoy had recently asked for a payment of \$500,
21 which was promptly paid. On December 24, 2000, Mr. Tatarinov received a
22 letter from Verhovskoy. It stated Verhovskoy would no longer represent Mr.
23 Tatarinov, and advised him to retain other counsel. The letter provided no
24 explanation. Excerpts of Record, pp. 4, 30. On January 19, 2001, Mr. Tatarinov
25 received a notice from the California State Bar indicating Verhovskoy was
26 "suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of
27 sixty (60) days." Mr. Tatarinov retained another attorney to represent him in the
28

1 immigration matter. Excerpts of Record, pp. 4, 115.

2
3 On January 28, 2000, Mr. Tatarinov filed a Complaint Form with The
4 State Bar of California regarding Verhovskoy's failure to file the appeal and
5 nonperformance in other legal matters. Excerpts of Record, pp. 128-130. The
6 State Bar of California assigned case number 01-O-00503 and the disciplinary
7 case settled on September 30, 2002. By failing to prepare and file appellate briefs
8 and not notifying Mr. Tatarinov of his actions, Verhovskoy was found to have
9 failed "to perform legal services with competence, in violation of Rules of
10 Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)." Excerpts of Record, pp. 131-134

11 On January 6, 1995, Mr. Tatarinov was granted Conditional Permanent
12 Resident Status based upon his marriage. In December 1996, he filed a petition
13 to remove that status. That application was not adjudicated until several years
14 later. In fact, it was not until Mr. Tatarinov was in Removal Proceedings that the
15 Immigration and Naturalization Service decided to remove the condition, making
16 him a Lawful Permanent Resident. As a result of his convictions, Mr. Tatarinov
17 was placed in removal proceedings on June 24, 1998. The Immigration Judge
18 found him removable as an alien convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude
19 within five years of admission pursuant to section 237(a)(2)(A)(i) of the
20 Immigration and Nationality Act, as well as an alien convicted of two or more
21 crimes involving moral turpitude. Excerpts of Record, pp. 115-117.

22 ARGUMENTS

23
24 I. Attorney's conduct resulted in an irreconcilable conflict of interest
25 between him and his client violating the Sixth Amendment right to
26 conflict-free representation.

27 The guarantees of the Sixth Amendment entitle defendants in criminal
28

1 cases the right to effective assistance of counsel, which includes the right to
2 conflict-free representation. *United States v. Mett*, 65 F.3d 1531 (9th cir. 1995.)
3 “Where a constitutional right to counsel exists, our Sixth Amendment cases hold
4 that there is a correlative right to representation that is free from conflicts of
5 interest.” *Wood v. Georgia*, 450 U.S. 262,271 (1981). “The defense counsel had
6 a duty to alert the court to the existence of conflicts and to assist the court in
7 determining whether the conflict has been properly waived, if a waiver exists.”
8 *People v. Mroczko*, 35 C3d 86 (1983).

9
10 The possibility of a conflict of interest is insufficient to impugn a criminal
11 conviction. In order to establish a violation of the Sixth Amendment, a defendant
12 must show that an actual conflict of interest adversely affected his lawyer's
13 performance. *Cuyler v. Sullivan*, 446 U.S. 335 (1980).

14 Verhovskoy had a duty to inform the court of the prior trial, SCD 119330,
15 his failure to file the appellate brief and his deceit regarding the appeal.
16 Verhovskoy was aware that his representation in the prior case was incompetent.
17 “In criminal cases, an attorney’s representation of a former client may preclude
18 renewed representation of that client in a new matter if the prior representation
19 resulted in the client’s conviction. Reason: The client may want to attack the
20 prior conviction on the ground of incompetent representation.” (*People v. Bailey*,
21 (1992) 9 CA4th 1252, 1254-1255, 12CR2d 339, 340-341 – permitting trial
22 counsel to represent same client on appeal puts the counsel in “the untenable
23 position of urging his own incompetency”; San Diego Bar Ass’n Form. Opn.
24 1995-1-lawyer representing a former client on new matter involving “three
25 strikes” violation must decline representation if prior representation deemed
26 inadequate.) California Practice Guide Professional Responsibility 2005, 6-142
27
28

1 [6:900].

2
3 Verhovskoy's continued representation of Mr. Tatarinov after failing to
4 file the SCD 119330 appellate brief is an "actual" conflict. The instant
5 Verhovskoy failed to file the appellate brief per Mr. Tatarinov's request, April
6 28, 1997, Verhovskoy created an actual conflict between him and Mr. Tatarinov.

7 Verhovskoy hid the fact he failed to file the appellate brief by lying to Mr.
8 Tatarinov about the status of the appeal. From April 1997 through December
9 2000 Verhovskoy kept Mr. Tatarinov as a paying client by lies and
10 misrepresentations. It was only after the California State Bar, on another matter,
11 suspended his license that Verhovskoy was forced to terminate the relationship.
12 "An attorney has an actual, as opposed to a potential, conflict of interest when,
13 during the course of the representation, the attorney's and the defendant's
14 interests diverge with respect to a material factual or legal issue or to a course of
15 action." *United States v. Levy*, 25 F3d 146 (2d Cir. 1994.) There is a
16 "presumption of prejudice where conflict is actual." California Practice Guide
17 Professional Responsibility 2005, 6-138 [6:846]. "An actual conflict of interest
18 on the part of defense counsel can constitute ineffective assistance of counsel and
19 mandate reversal of a criminal conviction or sentence." California Practice
20 Guide Professional Responsibility 2005, 6-133 [6:820].

21
22 II. Attorney's misconduct in permitting defendant's state appeal in another
23 case to be dismissed, in lying about the status of the dismissed appeal, and
24 representing that nothing could be done to revive the appeal, requires a
25 finding of counsel's conflict of interest resulting in ineffective assistance
26 of counsel violating the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth
27 Amendment.
28

1 *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353 (1963), held that the Fourteenth
2 Amendment guarantees a criminal defendant the right to counsel on his first
3 appeal as of right. The U.S. Supreme Court later held “The Due Process Clause
4 of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees a criminal defendant the effective
5 assistance of counsel on his first appeal as of right.”
6

7 Mr. Tatarinov retained Verhovskoy to file his appeal. Verhovskoy failed
8 to file the appellate brief causing the dismissal of the appeal and misled Mr.
9 Tatarinov for several years regarding the status of the appeal. After Mr.
10 Tatarinov learned that the appeal had been dismissed, Verhovskoy continued to
11 lie, deceive and provide misinformation to Mr. Tatarinov hiding the fact he had
12 acted incompetently. Verhovskoy’s failure to file a brief resulted in the dismissal
13 of Mr. Tatarinov’s appeal, violating the Fourteenth Amendment Due Process
14 clause guaranteeing that Mr. Tatarinov have effective assistance of counsel on
15 his first appeal as of right and as such, created an actual conflict between the
16 Defendant and Verhovskoy violating his rights in the later case to conflict free
17 representation.
18

19 III. Attorney’s misconduct in permitting defendant’s state appeal in another
20 case to be dismissed, in lying about the status of the dismissed appeal,
21 failure to file a “Wende brief” to protect defendant’s rights, and
22 representing that nothing could be done to revive the appeal, requires a
23 finding of counsel’s conflict of interest resulting in ineffective assistance
24 of counsel violating the Sixth Amendment guarantee that a defendant has
25 the assistance necessary to justify reliance on the outcome of the
26 proceeding.

27 Verhovskoy failed to honor Mr. Tatarinov’s request to file an appeal by
28

1 not submitting the brief. *Rodriguez v. U.S.*, 395 U.S. 327 (1969), held that a
2 lawyer who disregards a defendant's specific instructions to file a notice of
3 appeal acts in a professionally unreasonable manner and "those whose right to
4 appeal has been frustrated should be treated exactly like any other appellants;
5 they should not be given an additional hurdle to clear just because their rights
6 were violated at some earlier stage in the proceedings. The petitioner in the
7 *Rodriguez* case was of "Mexican descent and that his knowledge of the English
8 language was limited. He further contended that his retained counsel had
9 fraudulently deprived him of his right to appeal." In Mr. Tatarinov's case, we
10 have a Russian immigrant who specifically retained a Russian-speaking lawyer
11 as Mr. Tatarinov's knowledge of the English language was limited. Although
12 Verhovskoy filed the notice of appeal, he did not file the brief, failing to perfect
13 an appeal on behalf of Mr. Tatarinov. This failure to perfect the appeal and lying
14 to Mr. Tatarinov regarding the appeal "fraudulently deprived" Mr. Tatarinov of
15 his appeal creating an actual conflict of interest which later deprived Mr.
16 Tatarinov of conflict free representation.
17

18
19 Following the *Rodriguez* ruling, *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668
20 (1984) provided a framework for evaluating counsel's performance. Under
21 *Strickland* "The Sixth Amendment right to counsel is the right to the effective
22 assistance of counsel, and the benchmark for judging any claim of
23 ineffectiveness must be whether counsel's conduct so undermined the proper
24 functioning of the adversarial process that the trial cannot be relied on as having
25 produced a just result." Verhovskoy's conduct of failing to prepare and file the
26 appellate brief, and lying to the Defendant was of such deficient performance that
27 Mr. Tatarinov was denied his right to conflict free representation. "In certain
28

1 Sixth Amendment contexts, prejudice is presumed. Actual or constructive denial
2 of the assistance of counsel altogether is legally presumed to result in prejudice.”

3 *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). “The complete denial of
4 counsel during a critical stage of a judicial proceeding, however, mandates a
5 presumption of prejudice because “the adversary process itself” has been
6 rendered “presumptively unreliable.”” *United States v. Cronin*, 466 U.S. 648,
7 659 (1984).
8

9 IV. The motion to vacate is made on grounds that could not have been raised
10 on direct appeal from the judgment itself and is not a duplicate appeal
11 from the judgment itself.

12 Under California law, a defendant may appeal from an order made after
13 judgment, affecting the substantial rights of the defendant. Penal Code §1237 (a)
14 &(b). An appeal from a post-judgment motion to vacate a guilty plea based on a
15 claim of ineffective assistance of counsel will be appealable since the basis for
16 the claim is generally not contained in the record and could not have been raised
17 on direct appeal. This is the “silent record exception” - an appeal is allowed
18 where the record on appeal from the judgment would not have shown the error
19 sought to be asserted. *Verhovskoy’s* conflict of interest constitutes ineffective
20 assistance of counsel. *Rodriguez v. U.S.*, 395 U.S. 327 (1969), “a lawyer who
21 disregards a defendant’s specific instructions to file a notice of appeal acts in a
22 professionally unreasonable manner.”
23

24 As a result of his conviction Mr. Tatarinov was found to be removable as
25 an alien convicted of a crime of moral turpitude and is being deported. As such,
26 the ruling denying a motion to vacate judgment would qualify based upon the
27 violation of Mr. Tatarinov’s Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment rights by the
28

1 actions of Verhovskoy as an order after judgment affecting Mr. Tatarinov's
2 substantial rights and is therefore appealable.
3

4 The Court of Appeal - State of California, Fourth Appellate District,
5 Division One granted Respondent's motion to dismiss. The Respondent's
6 motion stated that the "trial court lacked jurisdiction," and therefore the appeal
7 was from an "unappealable order." In *People v Banks*, 53 Cal.2d 370 (1959), the
8 court exercised its inherent power to accept an appeal from an apparently
9 unappealable order denying a post-judgment motion to vacate a guilty plea
10 because the defendant raised an important constitutional question of first
11 impression.

12 For every constitutional violation there must be a remedy. "Fundamental
13 jurisdictional defects, like constitutional defects, do not become irremediable
14 when a judgment of conviction becomes final without appeal (or even after
15 affirmance on appeal)." *Mooney v. Holohan*, 294 US 103 (1935). California
16 courts must entertain nonstatutory motions to invalidate particular stages of a
17 criminal case, even entire criminal convictions, on constitutional grounds. This
18 rule – that constitutional violations must find a remedy even if no statute
19 provides one – has been specifically applied to claims of ineffective counsel.
20 *Murguia v. Municipal Court*, 15 Cal.3d 286, 124 (1975); *People v. Fosselman*,
21 33 Cal.3d 572, 189 (1983). The court therefore has inherent authority to grant a
22 post-judgment motion to vacate a judgment when the constitutional rights of the
23 accused have been violated.
24

25 V. This motion is timely filed as the substantial rights of the defendant are
26 adversely affected by the immigration proceedings defendant is facing.
27 California Penal Code Section 1237, provides that a defendant may appeal
28

1 from "a final judgment of conviction (§ 1237, subd. (a)) or from "any order made
2 after judgment, affecting the substantial rights of the party" (§ 1237, subd. (b)).
3 This permits an appeal from any post judgment order that affects the "substantial
4 rights" of the defendant, the right to appeal is limited by the qualification that,
5 ordinarily, no appeal lies from an order denying a motion to vacate a judgment of
6 conviction on a ground which could have been reviewed on appeal from the
7 judgment." Mr. Tatarinov's nonstatutory motion to vacate brought in the San
8 Diego Superior Court is based on ineffective assistance of counsel and does not
9 address grounds that would have been reviewed on appeal.
10

11 There is no time limit in which the Section 1237 motion may be made.
12 Mr. Tatarinov has been in Removal Proceedings with the Immigration and
13 Naturalization Service proceedings since June 24, 1998. On February 9, 2007
14 the United States Court of Appeals denied his Petition and he was ordered to
15 surrender to the nearest Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Detention and
16 Removal Office by March 6, 2007. Mr. Tatarinov is currently in custody with
17 Immigration Customs Enforcement awaiting deportation stemming from the
18 conviction in this case. "[A] motion is timely if brought within a reasonable
19 time after the conviction actually 'may have' such consequences." *People v.*
20 *Superior Court (Zamudio)*, (2000) 23 Cal.4th 183. Therefore, the post-
21 conviction nonstatutory motion to vacate a judgment entered after court trial on
22 grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel was timely as the actual collateral
23 consequences of his conviction are now being realized.
24
25
26
27
28

CONCLUSION

The consequences of Mr. Tatarinov's failure to receive conflict free and competent representation are a reversal of the conviction and for this reason, Mr. Tatarinov asks this Court to grant his petition under USC §2241 to vacate the judgment entered on grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel based on defense counsel's actual conflict of interest resulting in violations of Mr. Tatarinov's rights under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Lynn Jacks 10-19-07

Patricia Lynn Jacks

Attorney for Petitioner

Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P.
32(a)(7)(C) and Circuit Rule 32-1 for
DMITRI VALLERVEICH TATARINOV, Petitioner

The brief is proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more and
contains 4,324 words.

Patricia Lynn Jacks 10-19-07
Patricia Lynn Jacks
Attorney for Petitioner

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

Name Patricia Jacks

Case Number:

Address 450 B Street, Suite 1480
San Diego, CA 92101

I, undersigned, say: I am over 18 years of age, employed in the County of San Diego, California, in which county the within-mentioned delivery occurred, and not a party to the subject cause. My business address is 450 B Street, Suite 1480, San Diego, California. I served the PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. §2241 and EXCERPTS OF RECORD - DMITRI V. TATARINOV of which a true and correct copy of the document filed in the cause is affixed, by placing a copy thereof in a separate envelope for each addressee named hereafter, addressed to each such addressee respectively as follows:

Department of Justice, Office of Attorney General
110 West A Street, Suite 1100
PO Box 85266
San Diego, CA 92186-5266

Each envelope was then sealed and with the postage thereon fully prepaid deposited in the United States mail by me at San Diego, California, on 10-19-07

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed on 10-19-07, at San Diego, California.

Patricia Ly Jacks

JS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Dmitri Valleriush TATARINOV

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff SAN DIEGO
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

PATRICIA LYNN JACKS
5740 FRIMAS ROAD FB
SAN DIEGO CA 92110

619 574-1625

DEFENDANTS

2007 OCT 19 PM 4:43
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIF.
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

'07 CV 2033 L NLS

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

V. ORIGIN

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2 Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify)
- ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation
- ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

~~28 USC 2241~~

Brief description of cause:

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL - motion to vacate

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND:

☐ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

10-19-07

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

Patricia Lynn Jacks

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

143719

AMOUNT

350.-

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

10/19/07

**UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT**
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO DIVISION

**# 143719 - SR
* * C O P Y * *
October 19, 2007
13:51:09**

Habeas Corpus

USAO #: 07CV2033 HABEAS

Judge.: M. JAMES LORENZ

Amount.: \$5.00 CA

Total-> \$5.00

**FROM: TATARINOV V. SUPERIOR COURT
HABEAS CORPUS**